UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,362	07/04/2004	Eric Schneider	93767	4361

22242 7590 10/13/2010

FITCH EVEN TABIN & FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LASALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER	
VOSTAL, ONDREJ C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2453	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/710,362	SCHNEIDER, ERIC	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	O.C. Vostal	2453	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 August 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 presented for examination.

2. This action is in response to remarks and arguments filed on August 6, 2010, after non-final rejection of application 10/710362. Application filed on July 4, 2004.

Paper Submitted

3. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file:

   a. **Information Disclosure Statements** as received seven statements on August 6, 2010 were considered.

Claim Interpretations

4. Applicant is informed that a "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result for a process step positively recited" (MPEP 2111.04) and that "the following are examples of language that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim" (MPEP 2106, Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, II. Determining What Applicant has

Invented and is Seeking to Patent, C. Review the Claims). "Adapted to", "adapted for", "wherein", and "whereby" language may not be given as much patentable weight as a limitation that is positively (actively) recited within the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst, US Patent Number 6,560,634 B1, and in views of Hatakeyama et al., US Patent Number 5,454,105 A, hereinafter Hatakeyama.

7. Regarding claim 1, Broadhurst discloses a method comprising:

receiving, at a computing device, one or more identifiers and one or more data request types (Broadhurst; col 1 lines 26-44, col 1 lines 65-67, col 2 lines 1-15 and 32-40, col 3 lines 38-42, col 4 lines 23-35 and col 5 lines 28-34: The examiner considers "query results in the generation of a response

indicating" is similar to receiving, at a computer device, considers "a domain name is the identifier by which an individual", "specified Internet host name (e.g., apple) has been registered in a specified domain" and "resulting in a domain name (e.g., apple.co.uk)" is similar to one or more identifiers, considers " 'apple,' and a type", "a type of mnemonic for that IP address" and "apple.co.uk", "domain extension suffix '.co.uk' when combined with the domain name 'apple' " and "may also contain the numerical address" is similar to one or more data request types.);

generating and performing a first data query from at least one source identified by said one or more identifiers and having a data type associated with a first data request type of said one or more data request types (Broadhurst; col 3 lines 1-4 and 48-50 col 4 line 1 and 55-57); and,

retrieving at least one first result from the at least one source in response to said first data query (Broadhurst; col 5 lines 20-25 and 27-30);

Broadhurst does not disclose steps of generating, retrieving and automatically generated, but in a similar field of endeavor Hatakeyama disclose:

generating and performing a second data query derived from said one or more identifiers and from a second data request type of said one or more data query types, wherein said second data request type is of a type different from said first data request type (Hatakeyama; col 2 lines 62-67 and col 3 lines 15-51: The examiner considers "a new query" is similar to generating and performing a second data query, considers "search

requests together with the identifiers of the terminals" is similar to derived from said one or more identifiers and from a second data request type, considers "search requests registered" and "registering therein" is similar to first data request type, considers "computer" is similar to second data request type. [Official Notice]: It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize that being "registered" and receiving an "identifier" and/or "apple.co.uk" by Broadhurst and Broadhurst's registering is referred to using "identifiers of the terminals issued these requests" by Hatekeyama. Also, Broadhurst's "' apple', and a type" and "apple.co.uk" data request type is different data request type then "computer", "bio-technology" and "processing is performed in accordance with the type of the query statement" (Hatekeyama; col 14 lines 17-45). And, Hatekeyama's "computer" and "bio-technology" are different data request types as explained by Hatakeyama.); and,

retrieving at least one second result from the at least one source in response to said second data query (Hatakeyama; fig 2 and col 3 lines 1-10: The examiner considers "allotment of results" in fig 2 is similar to retrieving at least one second result.).

wherein said second data query is automatically generated based on said first data query to select said at least one second result having content associated with, but not identified by, said first data query (Hatakeyama;

col 2 lines 62-67, col 3 lines 12-51 and col 14 lines 18-44: The examiner considers “a new query”, “computer”, “search queries are consolidated” and “ new query consolidating the search requests” are similar to a second data query is automatically generated, considers “search requests together with the identifiers of the terminals” is similar to based on said first data query to select said at least one second result, considers “(computer)”, “search requests registered”, “registering therein” and “processing is performed in accordance to the type of the query statement” is similar to first data request type. [Official Notice]: It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize that being “registered” and receiving an “identifier” and/or “apple.co.uk” by Broadhurst and referred to “identifiers of the terminals issued these requests” by Hatekeyama which has identifier of the terminals is similar to a result having content associated with, but not identified by.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst’s system that provides the user “an improved query server” (Broadhurst) that provides “searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user” (Broadhurst) with the features

of Hatakeyama's system for "a document information (data) search or retrieving" (Hatakeyama; col 2 lines 1-10).

The motivation being "performing a multitude of searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) , "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) and "eliminating the need for a user to perform individual searches" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhurst) which includes "search requests can be disposed of with higher efficiency" (Hatakeyama) and includes upon connection, request to register and followed by various requests… allows for smooth internet surfing.

8. Regarding claim 2, Broadhurst discloses further comprising at least one of a generating and parsing said one or more identifiers and said one or more data request types from at least one input source (Broadhurst; col 5 lines 24-28).

9. Regarding claim 3, Broadhurst discloses wherein said at least one input source is from at least one of a data file, internet content, audio signal, closed caption text, activation of a hyperlink, network resource redirection, autosearch, resource identifier, and user interface device (Broadhurst; col 4 lines 23-28).

.

10. Regarding claim 7, Broadhurst discloses further comprising presenting said at least one second result from said second data query (Broadhurst; col 6 lines 15-25) either one of a before, during, and after presenting said at least one first result from said first data request (Broadhurst; col 6 lines 38-44).

11. Regarding claim 8, Broadhurst discloses further comprising generating and performing at least one additional data query based on said one or more identifiers and said one or more of data request types (Broadhurst; col 5 lines 27-30 and 45-60 and col 6 lines 10-14), and retrieving at least one additional result corresponding to said at least one additional data query (Broadhurst; col 6 lines 15-25).

12. Regarding claim 9, Broadhurst discloses further comprising presenting said additional results from said at least one additional data query (Broadhurst; col 6 lines 15-25) either one of a before, during, and after presenting said at least one first result from said first data request (Broadhurst; col 6 lines 38-44).

13. Regarding claim 13, Broadhurst discloses further comprising returning from at least one registration server an address or a resource corresponding to at least one identifier of said one or more identifiers (Broadhurst; col 4 lines 42-50).

14. Regarding claim 14, Broadhurst discloses wherein said at least one registration server is selected from a group consisting of one or more a domain name system, a fictitious domain name system, a multilingual naming system, a keyword system, a telephone naming and numbering system, a user naming system, an address naming system, a catalog naming system, a document naming system, a resource naming system, an image naming system, a geographic naming system, a government naming system, a motor vehicle identifier naming system, and an identification naming system (Broadhurst; col 2 lines 42-55 and col 4 lines 35-67).

15. Regarding claim 17, Broadhurst discloses a device comprising:

a processor (col 3 lines 66-67, Broadhurst);

a memory in operative association with said processor (col 3 lines 66-67 and col 4 lines 1-5, Broadhurst);

said processor being adapted to receive one or more identifiers and one or more data request types (Broadhurst; col 1 lines 26-44, col 1 lines 65-67, col 2 lines 1-15 and 32-40, col 3 lines 38-42, col 4 lines 23-35, col 5 lines 28-34 and col 7 lines 20-25: The examiner considers “query results in the generation of a response indicating” is similar to receiving, at a computer device, considers “a domain name is the identifier by which an individual”, “specified Internet host name (e.g., apple) has been registered in a specified domain” and “resulting in a domain name (e.g., apple.co.uk)” is

similar to one or more identifiers, considers " 'apple,' and a type", "a type of mnemonic for that IP address" and "apple.co.uk", "domain extension suffix '.co.uk' when combined with the domain name 'apple' " and "may also contain the numerical address" is similar to one or more data request types.);

said processor being adapted to generate and perform a first data query from at least one source identified by said one or more identifiers and having a data type associated with a first data request type of said one or more data request types (Broadhurst; col 3 lines 1-4 and 48-50 col 4 line 1 and 55-57); and,

said processor being adapted to retrieve at least one first result from the at least one source in response to said first data query (Broadhurst; col 5 lines 20-25 and 27-30);

Broadhurst does not disclose steps of generating, retrieving and automatically generated, but in a similar field of endeavor Hatakeyama disclose:

said processor being adapted to generate and perform a second data query derived from said one or more identifiers and from a second data request type of said one or more data request types, wherein said second data request type is of a type different from said first data request type (Hatakeyama; col 2 lines 62-67 and col 3 lines 15-51: The examiner considers "a new query" is similar to generating and performing a second data query, considers "search requests together with the identifiers of the

terminals" is similar to derived from said one or more identifiers and from a second data request type, considers "search requests registered" and "registering therein" is similar to first data request type, considers "computer" is similar to second data request type. [Official Notice]: It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize that being "registered" and receiving an "identifier" and/or "apple.co.uk" by Broadhurst and Broadhurst's registering is referred to using "identifiers of the terminals issued these requests" by Hatekeyama. Also, Broadhurst's "' apple', and a type" and "apple.co.uk" data request type is different data request type then "computer", "bio-technology" and "processing is performed in accordance with the type of the query statement" (Hatekeyama; col 14 lines 17-45). And, Hatekeyama's "computer" and "bio-technology" are different data request types as explained by Hatakeyama.) and,

said processor being adapted to retrieve at least one second result from the at least one source in response to said second data query (Hatakeyama; fig 2 and col 3 lines 1-10: The examiner considers "allotment of results" in fig 2 is similar to retrieving at least one second result.).

wherein said second data query is automatically generated based on said first data query to select said at least one second result having content associated with, but not identified by, said first data query (Hatakeyama; col 2 lines 62-67 and col 3 lines 15-51: The examiner considers "a new

query" and/or "computer" are similar to a second data query is automatically generated, considers "search requests together with the identifiers of the terminals" is similar to based on said first data query to select said at least one second result, considers "search requests registered" and "registering therein" is similar to first data request type. [Official Notice]: It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize that being "registered" by Broadhurst and referred to by Hatekeyama which has identifier of the terminals is similar to a result having content associated with, but not identified by.)

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Hatakeyama's system for "a document information (data) search or retrieving" (Hatakeyama; col 2 lines 1-10).

The motivation being "performing a multitude of searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) , "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) and "eliminating the need for a user to perform

individual searches" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhurst) which includes "search requests can be disposed of with higher efficiency" (Hatakeyama) and includes upon connection, request to register and followed by various requests… allows for smooth internet surfing.

16. Regarding claim 18, Broadhurst discloses an article of manufacture including a computer program storage medium having instructions stored thereon that, upon execution by a computing device, cause the computing device to perform operations (Broadhurst; col 5 lines 2-5 and 65-67) comprising:

receiving one or more identifiers and one or more data request types (Broadhurst; col 1 lines 26-44, col 1 lines 65-67, col 2 lines 1-15 and 32-40, col 3 lines 38-42, col 4 lines 23-35 and col 5 lines 28-34: The examiner considers "query results in the generation of a response indicating" is similar to receiving, at a computer device, considers "a domain name is the identifier by which an individual", "specified Internet host name (e.g., apple) has been registered in a specified domain" and "resulting in a domain name (e.g., apple.co.uk)" is similar to one or more identifiers, considers " 'apple,' and a type", "a type of mnemonic for that IP address" and "apple.co.uk", "domain extension suffix '.co.uk' when combined with the domain name 'apple' " and "may also contain the numerical address" is similar to one or more data request types.),

generating and performing a first data query from at least one source identified by said one or more identifiers and having a data type associated with a first data request type of said one or more data request types (Broadhurst; col 3 lines 1-4 and 48-50 col 4 line 1 and 55-57); and,

retrieving at least one first result from the at least one source in response to said first data query (Broadhurst col 5 lines 20-25 and 27-30),

Broadhurst does not disclose generating, retrieving and automatically generated, but in a similar field of endeavor Hatakeyama disclose:

generating and performing a second data query derived from said one or more identifiers and from a second data request type of said one or more data query types, wherein said second data request type is of a type different from said first data request type (Hatakeyama; col 2 lines 62-67 and col 3 lines 15-51: The examiner considers "a new query" is similar to generating and performing a second data query, considers "search requests together with the identifiers of the terminals" is similar to derived from said one or more identifiers and from a second data request type, considers "search requests registered" and "registering therein" is similar to first data request type, considers "computer" is similar to second data request type. [Official Notice]: It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize that being "registered" and receiving an "identifier" and/or "apple.co.uk" by Broadhurst and Broadhurst's registering is referred to using "identifiers of

the terminals issued these requests" by Hatekeyama. Also, Broadhurst's "' apple', and a type" and "apple.co.uk" data request type is different data request type then "computer", "bio-technology" and "processing is performed in accordance with the type of the query statement" (Hatekeyama; col 14 lines 17-45). And, Hatekeyama's "computer" and "bio-technology" are different data request types as explained by Hatakeyama.); and,

retrieving at least one second result from the at least one source in response to said second data query (Hatakeyama; fig 2 and col 3 lines 1-10: The examiner considers "allotment of results" in fig 2 is similar to retrieving at least one second result.).

wherein said second data query is automatically generated based on said first data query to select said at least one second result having content associated with, but not identified by, said first data query (Hatakeyama; col 2 lines 62-67 and col 3 lines 15-51: The examiner considers "a new query" and/or "computer" are similar to a second data query is automatically generated, considers "search requests together with the identifiers of the terminals" is similar to based on said first data query to select said at least one second result, considers "search requests registered" and "registering therein" is similar to first data request type. [Official Notice]: It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize that being

"registered" by Broadhurst and referred to by Hatekeyama which has identifier of the terminals is similar to a result having content associated with, but not identified by.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Hatakeyama's system for "a document information (data) search or retrieving" (Hatakeyama; col 2 lines 1-10).

The motivation being "performing a multitude of searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) , "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) and "eliminating the need for a user to perform individual searches" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhurst) which includes "search requests can be disposed of with higher efficiency" (Hatakeyama) and includes upon connection, request to register and followed by various requests… allows for smooth internet surfing.

17. Regarding claim 20, Broadhurst does not disclose claim 20, but in a similar field of endeavor Hatakeyama disclose wherein said first data query comprises a

content data string and said second data query is generated based on said content data string to select said at least one second result having content associated with, but not identified by, said content data string (Hatakeyama; fig 13: The examiner considers "text data" is similar to content data string.).

18. Regarding claim 21, Broadhurst discloses further comprising parsing said one or more identifiers and said one or more data request types from at least one input source, said at least one input source being received from a user interface device from a browser (Broadhurst; col 3 lines 25-35 and col 7 lines 15-23).

19. Regarding claim 23, Broadhurst discloses wherein said processor is adapted to parse said one or more identifiers and said one or more data request types from at least one input source, said at least one input source being received from a user interface device from a browser (Broadhurst; col 3 lines 25-35 and col 7 lines 15-23).

20. Claims 4-6, 10-12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst, US Patent Number 6,560,634 B1, and in views of Hatakeyama et al., US Patent Number 5,454,105 A, hereinafter Hatakeyama, as applied to claims 1-3 and 8 above, and further in views of Barry et al., US Patent Number 7,225,249 B1, hereinafter Barry.

21. Regarding claim 4, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 4, but in a similar field of endeavor Barry disclose further comprising inputting said one or more identifiers and said one or more data request types into one of a browser location field, text box, command line, speech to text interface, optical recognition interface, and magnetic recognition interface (Barry; col 5 lines 13-18, col 31 lines 55-67 and col 57 lines 49-55).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Barry's system that provides "a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with one or more telecommunications network management services provided by remote servers located in a telecommunications services provider's Intranet" (Barry).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhust) which includes "to provide connectivity to enterprise legacy systems without need to navigate various telephone exchanges, dialing standards or signal standards" (Barry).

22. Regarding claim 5, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 5, but in a similar field of endeavor Barry disclose wherein said generating and parsing said one or more identifiers comprises employing one or more of a word generation method, category of interest, dictionary, thesaurus, prefix, suffix, word root, word stem, set of heuristic naming rules, namespace syntax, identifier equivalent, language translation, phonetic spelling, phonemes, identifier watch list, list of desirable descriptors, personal identifier portfolio, competitor identifier portfolio, mnemonic method, abbreviation, namespace mapping, identifier mapping, delimiter mapping, rhyming method, name-to-number conversion, number-to-name conversion, and identifier history (Barry; col 3 lines 40-50) .

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Barry's system that provides "a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with one or more telecommunications network management services provided by remote servers located in a telecommunications services provider's Intranet" (Barry).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhust) which includes "to provide connectivity to enterprise legacy systems without need to navigate various telephone exchanges, dialing standards or signal standards" (Barry).

23. Regarding claim 6, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 6, but in a similar field of endeavor Barry disclose wherein said one or more data request types is selected from a group including a prefix request, a suffix request, a command request, a resolution request, a redirection request, a search request, an identifier registration request, a commerce request, a subscription request, a navigation request, a dialing request, a messaging request, a conferencing request, a vendor request, a service request, a login request, a status request, an authorization request, and a reference request (Barry; col 31 lines 67, col 34 lines 18-21 and col 54 lines 55-59).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Barry's system that provides "a graphical user interface for

enabling a user to interact with one or more telecommunications network management services provided by remote servers located in a telecommunications services provider's Intranet" (Barry).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhust) which includes "to provide connectivity to enterprise legacy systems without need to navigate various telephone exchanges, dialing standards or signal standards" (Barry).

23. Regarding claim 10, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 10, but in a similar field of endeavor Barry disclose wherein said at least one data query is performed by at least one service provider (Barry; col 8 lines 27-39).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Barry's system that provides "a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with one or more telecommunications network

management services provided by remote servers located in a telecommunications services provider's Intranet" (Barry).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhust) which includes "to provide connectivity to enterprise legacy systems without need to navigate various telephone exchanges, dialing standards or signal standards" (Barry).

24. Regarding claim 11, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 11, but in a similar field of endeavor Barry disclose wherein said at least one service provider provides at least one of identifier registration services, search engine services, internet provider services, application services, information services, reference services, knowledge base services, web hosting services, publishing services, communication services, telecommunication services, incorporation services, trademark services, bookmark services, mapping services, image services, delivery services, messaging services, conferencing services, name resolution services, redirection services, registry services, renewal services, alert services, escrow and transfer services, valuation services, auction services and listing services (Barry; col 8 lines 27-39 and 60-67).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Barry's system that provides "a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with one or more telecommunications network management services provided by remote servers located in a telecommunications services provider's Intranet" (Barry).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhust) which includes "to provide connectivity to enterprise legacy systems without need to navigate various telephone exchanges, dialing standards or signal standards" (Barry).

25. Regarding claim 12, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 12, but in a similar field of endeavor Barry disclose wherein each said one or more identifiers comprise at least one of a valid domain name, fictitious domain name, domain name having a top level domain alias (TLDA), multilingual domain name, phone number, keyword, Publisher Item Identifier (PII), Digital Object Identifier (DOI), Inter Deposit Digital Number (IDDN), International Standard Book Number

(ISBN), International Standard Technical Report Number (ISRN), International Standard Serial Number (ISSN), Serial Item and Contribution Identifier (SICI), Book Item and Component Identifier (BICI), European Article Number (EAN), Universal Product Code (UPC), Standard Address Number (SAN), international Standard Audiovisual Number (ISAN), International Standard Work Code (ISWC), International Standard Music Number (ISMN), International Standard Recording Code (ISRC), Intellectual Property Identification (IPI), Uniform File Identifier (UFI), Uniform Resource Identifier (URI), Persistent Uniform Resource Locator (PURL), Universally Unique Identifier (UUID), Globally Unique Identifier (GUID), Namespace Identifier (NID), Bank Identification Number (BIN), Personal Identification Number (PIN), Mod 10 Number, credit card number, Electronic Serial Number (ESN), Mobile Identification Number (MIN), Automatic Number Identification (ANI), Social Security Number (SSN), Employer Identification Number (EIN), Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN), Vehicle Identification Number (VIN), World manufacturer identifier (WMI), Manufacturer Identification Number (MIN), Market Identifier Code (MIC), Standard Industrial Classification (SIC), Standard Occupational Classification (SOC), Stock Keeping Unit number (SKU), International Business Entity Identifier (IBEI), Institution Identification Code (IIC), National Provider Identifier (NPI), Dunn and Bradstreet Number (DUNS), SEC file number, patent number, trademark number, serial number, charter number, policy number, certification number, document identifier, reference number, invoice number, transaction identifier, validation code,

account number, merchant code, reseller code, affiliate code, authorization code, network identifier, user identifier, PCP key, digital certificate, driver license number, license plate number, trademark, service mark, tradename, fictitious name, company name, DBA, AKA, stock symbol, station identifier, broadcast station call letters, ham radio call letters, broadcast frequency number, street name, street address, ZIP code, IP address, host, e-mail address, ICQ number, nickname, screen name, username, alias, handle, document title, book title, song title, movie title, phrase, slogan, machine readable code, glyph, image, icon, animation, sequence of musical notes, date, time, name, abbreviation, mnemonic, moniker, label and token (Barry; col 14 lines 5-10, col 111 lines 48-54 and col 112 lines 50-58).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Barry's system that provides "a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with one or more telecommunications network management services provided by remote servers located in a telecommunications services provider's Intranet" (Barry).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhust) which includes "to provide connectivity to enterprise legacy systems without need to navigate various telephone exchanges, dialing standards or signal standards" (Barry).

26. Regarding claim 15, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 15, but in a similar field of endeavor Barry disclose wherein said at least one data request comprises a prefix request and said one or more identifiers comprise an identifier prefix and at least one identifier (Barry; col 82 lines 43-45 and col 83 lines 55-62).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Barry's system that provides "a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with one or more telecommunications network management services provided by remote servers located in a telecommunications services provider's Intranet" (Barry).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhust) which includes "to provide connectivity to enterprise legacy systems without need to navigate various telephone exchanges, dialing standards or signal standards" (Barry).

27. Regarding claim 16, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 15, but in a similar field of endeavor Barry disclose wherein said at least one identifier prefix comprises at least one of a Edit prefix for editing, Handle prefix for aliasing, List prefix for listing, Status prefix for obtaining status, History prefix for listing a history, Watch prefix for adding to a watch list, Renew prefix for renewing, Transfer prefix for transferring, Escrow prefix for escrowing, Consolidate prefix for consolidating, Auction prefix for auctioning, Bid prefix for bidding, Value prefix for valuating, Buy prefix for buying, Sell prefix for selling, Lease prefix for leasing, Generate prefix for generating, WHOIS prefix for obtaining contact information, Expire prefix for determining an expiry date, Registrar prefix for listing a corresponding domain name registration provider, Tools prefix for accessing technical information, Redirect prefix for redirecting, Lock prefix for locking, Email prefix for accessing e-mail services, WebHost prefix for accessing hosting services, Incorporate prefix for accessing business formation services, Trademark prefix for accessing trademark information, Geo prefix for accessing

location information, and Dial prefix for accessing dialing services from said at least one identifier (Barry; col 83 lines 55-62).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Barry's system that provides "a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with one or more telecommunications network management services provided by remote servers located in a telecommunications services provider's Intranet" (Barry).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhust) which includes "to provide connectivity to enterprise legacy systems without need to navigate various telephone exchanges, dialing standards or signal standards" (Barry).

28. Claims 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst, US Patent Number 6,560,634 B1, and in views of Hatakeyama et al., US Patent Number 5,454,105 A, hereinafter Hatakeyama, as applied to

claims 17 and 18 above, and further in views of Damashek, US Patent Number 5,418,951.

29. Regarding claim 19, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 19, but in a similar field of endeavor Damashek discloses wherein said first data query comprises a content data string and said second data query is generated based on said content data string to select said at least one second result having content associated with, but not identified by, said content data string (Damashek; col 4 lines 63-67 and col 5 lines 1-5).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Damashek's system "to provide a method of retrieving documents, in a particular language, from a database by topic" (Damashek).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhurst) which includes "creating an n-gram array for each document in a database, parsing an unidentified document or query into n-grams, and based

on the similarity score, identifying retrieving, or sorting the document or query with-respect to language or topic" (Damashek).

30. Regarding claim 22, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama do not disclose claim 22, but in a similar field of endeavor Damashek discloses wherein said first data query comprises a content data string and said second data query is generated based on said content data string to select said at least one second result having content associated with, but not identified by, said content data string (string of characters) (Damashek; col 4 lines 63-67 and col 5 lines 1-5).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Broadhurst's and Hatakeyama's system that provides the user "an improved query server" (Broadhurst) that provides "searching techniques by performing a multitude to searches simultaneously, transparent to the user" (Broadhurst) with the features of Damashek's system "to provide a method of retrieving documents, in a particular language, from a database by topic" (Damashek).

The motivation being "a query for registered domain names in multiple countries" (Broadhurst) by removing "separate search requests to each domain" (Broadhurst) which includes "creating an n-gram array for each document in a database, parsing an unidentified document or query into n-grams, and based

on the similarity score, identifying retrieving, or sorting the document or query with-respect to language or topic" (Damashek).

Response to Arguments

31. Applicant's amendment and argument with respect to claims 1, 17 and 18 as filed on August 6, 2010, have been fully considered but they deemed to be moot in views of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant has failed to recite independent claims that would assert an inventive concept that has a significantly patentable distinction over all cited prior arts. Accordingly, 35 USC 103(a) rejections for claims 1-23 are applied.

32. Applicant stated Broadhurst fails to disclose, as recited in claim 1 in combination with other subject matter, "generating and performing a second data query derived from said one or more identifiers and from a second data request type of said one or more data request types;" "retrieving at least one second result from the at least one source in response to said second data query;" and "wherein said second data query is automatically generated based on said first data query to select said at least one second result having content associated with, but not identified by, said first data query."

Examiner's response is 35 USC 103(a) mapped rejection uses Hatekeyama to reject generating, retrieving and wherein generated steps, not Broadhurst.

33. Applicant stated Hatakeyama fails to disclose or suggest modifying Broadhust to include all these elements.

Examiner's response is 35 USC 103(a) mapped rejection presents how Hatakeyama's features are added to the modified Broadhurst's features. To assist Applicant, mapped rejection using Broadhurst's features were further clarified. The connecting feature/concept "identifier" is initially recited in receiving step of claim 1.

34. Applicant stated Hatakeyama is silent regarding "generating a second data query… wherein the second data query is automatically generated based on [a] first data query to select … at least one second result having content associated with, but not identified by, said first data query".

Examiner's response is 35 USC 103(a) mapped rejection using Hatakeyama feature(s) were further clarified to assist Applicant. Refer to 103(a) mapped rejection, above.

35. Applicant stated Hatakeyama does not retrieve a "first result" and "second result" as recited in claim 1.

Examiner's response is Hatkeyama is not required to retrieve as "first result" and "second result" because the two results are in two different retrieving steps (i.e., retrieving at least one first result and retrieving at least one second result.).

36. Applicant stated it is clear from (Hatakeyama, col 3 lines 29-33) that there are multiple distinct terminals making distinct search requests, but Hatakeyama is silent regarding derivation "from a second data request type".

Examiner's response is the step of "generating and performing a second data query derived from said one or more identifiers and from a second data request type" is satisfied by Hatakeyama's "consolidating the search requests" and "search processing by consolidating the search requests issued from a plurality of search request sources" (Hatakeyama; col 3 lines 25-30 and col 4 lines 32-36) and "processing is performed in accordance with the type of the query statement" (Hatekeyama; col 14 lines 18-44). Refer to 35 USC 103(a) mapped rejection for further clarification, above.

37. Applicant stated the identifiers of Hatakeyama are in reference to the identity of the terminal from which the search originated. The only data request type disclosed in Hatakeyama is a search for a character string within documents in a database. When read in context, this passage of Hatakeyama does not disclose or suggest a second data query "derived from said one or more identifiers and from a second data request type" as recite in claim 1.

Examiner's response is Examiner is apply the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims as recited in the claims, not as explained in the specification. To assist Applicant, Applicant to consider their claims without reading the details of the specification into the claims. Regarding "derived"… Hatakeyama's "consolidating" and "identifier of the terminal" is a form of deriving, as recited in claim. Oh, by the way.. Examiner noticed that "derived from" and/or equivalent scope is not in the original claims and specification. Specification [0057] merely states "correspond to" and "processed from". Clearly, Hatakeyama's feature

goes beyond. Furthermore, Broadhurst and Hatakeyama disclose different data request types which is permitted to use in the combination rejection.

38. Applicant stated the identifiers of Hatakeyama are in reference to where the search request originated, while the identifier recited in claim 1 is, in one example, the term being searched.

Examiner's response is claim 1 does not contain "the term being searched". Claim 1 step of wherein automatically generated recites "but not identified by" which is referring and supporting "one or more identifiers" in the step of receiving. If not, Applicant to clarify in claim. Specification [0034] explains "identified" and how differs from "identifier of terminal or source", however, examiner is not allowed to import material from specification into the claim to make and/or clarify limitations. Examiner is to apply broadest reasonable interpretation without importing from specification.

39. Applicant stated the Examiner states that Hatakeyama's "search requests registered" is a reference to "being registered" as disclosed by Broadhurst. ("It would have been obvious … to readily recognize that being 'registered' by Broadhurst and referred to by Hatakeyama is a different data request type that 'computer' data request type"). However, the "registering" in Broadhurst is completely different from the "registering" in Hatakeyama. Broadhurst's "registering" refers to domain name registration with the DNS, while Hatakeyama's "registering" refers to keeping track of the multiple distinct searches placed in the queue buffer. The concepts are quite different.

Furthermore, the term "computer" in Hatakeyama is not a data request type, as described above. Thus the reasoning behind combining these references behind common use of the term "registering" is flawed.

Examiner's response is first… the specification [0022] states "domain names are identifiers used for accessing a resource" and [0034] states "prefix terms from input that are identified as not necessary to perform a search" are different and have to be clarified in the claim. Second, Broadhurst introduces "registration" and uses "identifiers" in the registration. Hatakeyama uses the registered "identifiers of terminals or sources" to mark the requests. Hence, the combination. If the applicant believes this is different than what is recited in claim 1, then Applicant failed to import material from specification into the claim to resolve and clarify the difference.

40. Applicant stated if these references are combined, they do not combine to disclose or suggest more that one data request type. Broadhurst may disclose one data request type. Hatakeyama may disclose a different data request type. Neither disclose both a first data request type and a second data request type.

Examiner's response is both Broadhurst and Hatakeyama disclose more that two data request types. The references do not explicitly disclose "a first data request type" and "a second data request type" however, that is not required. The equivalent scope or an example(s) are all that is necessary to satisfy two different data request types. The 35 USC 103(a) mapped rejection was further clarified to assist Applicant. Refer to 103(a) mapped rejection, above.

41. Applicant stated there is not reason to combine the Broadhurst and Hatakeyama references. Broadhurst is directed to registering a domain name across multiple DNS servers. Hatakeyama is directed toward efficient processing of search requests received from multiple users. Hatakeyama teaches away from such use in that it is explicitly designed to collect multiple search requests from distinct users and return specific results to each user.

Examiner's response is that the MPEP 2144 (Supporting a Rejection under 35 USC 103 IV. Rationale Different from Applicant's is Permissible) states "the reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant".

42. Applicant stated there is no motivation to combine Broadhurst and Hatakeyama and, even if they were combined they do not combine to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Examiner's response is the motivation to combine is provided with the 35 USC 103(a) mapped rejection, above. Every element of claim 1 is satisfied when considering broadest reasonable interpretation, however when considering details from Specification there are differences. Again, Examiner is not to import material from specification into claims to make limitations and/or clarify.

Conclusion

43. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

44. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to O. Charlie Vostal whose telephone number is 571-270-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 5:00pm EST Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krista Zele can be reached on 571-272-7288. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-4992.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/O. C. Vostal/
Examiner
Art unit 2453
October 5, 2010

/Krista M. Zele/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2453